

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claims 8, 23, 38, and 54. The applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner, but claims 8, 23, 38, and 54 have been canceled, without prejudice.

BICEK

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 11, 16-18, 26, 30-33, 41, 46-49, and 57 as being anticipated by Bicek, U.S. Patent No. 4,107,519.

Bicek disclose a system for controlling devices located at the high-voltage terminal of an electrostatic accelerator, such as a tandem Van de Graaff accelerator. As identified by the Examiner, the system includes a laser 10, and a tank 12 enclosing a photodiode receiver 20. Within the tank 12 is also the electrical device, namely, the electrostatic accelerator. Accordingly Bicek disclose a system by which provides a laser beam to a photodiode receiver in a tank with an electrostatic accelerator.

Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Bicek by claiming an enclosure including a first device that selectively provides electrical power to the electrical device, wherein the electrical device is exterior to the enclosure.

The electrostatic accelerator and photodiode receiver 20 are within the tank 12 and there would be no motivation to separate the photodiode receiver 20 from the electrostatic accelerator.

Claims 2-7 and 9-15 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 1.

Claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Bicek by claiming a method for controlling a remotely located electrical device where the electrical device is exterior to the enclosure.

The electrostatic accelerator and photodiode receiver 20 are within the tank 12 and there would be no motivation to separate the photodiode receiver 20 from the electrostatic accelerator.

Claims 17-22 and 24-29 depend from claim 16, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 16.

Claim 30 patentably distinguishes over Bicek by claiming an enclosure including a first device that selectively provides electrical power to the electrical device, wherein the electrical device is exterior to the enclosure.

The electrostatic accelerator and photodiode receiver 20 are within the tank 12 and there would be no motivation to separate the photodiode receiver 20 from the electrostatic accelerator.

Claims 31-37 and 39-45 depend from claim 30, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 30.

Claim 46 patentably distinguishes over Bicek by claiming an enclosure including a first device that selectively provides electrical power to the electrical device, wherein the electrical device is exterior to the enclosure.

The electrostatic accelerator and photodiode receiver 20 are within the tank 12 and there would be no motivation to separate the photodiode receiver 20 from the electrostatic accelerator.

Claims 47-53 and 55-62 depend from claim 46, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 46.

Claims 63-72 depend from their respective independent claim and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for the respective independent claim.

MOSELEY ET AL.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 10-11, 16-20, 25-26, 30-35, 40-41, 46-51, and 56-57 as being anticipated by Moseley et al., U.S. patent No. 5,099,193.

Moseley et al., disclose a transmitter 20, normally including batteries, for a lighting system that provides a signal to a receiver 710 enclosed within a housing. The receiver 710 then selective switches on a light bulb 712. Accordingly, the system disclosed by Moseley et al. includes a movable remote control, similar to that for a television, for controlling the light.

Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Moseley et al. by claiming that the transmitter and the receiver are maintained in a fixed relationship with respect to one another.

The transmitter is a handheld movable device and there would be no motivation to maintain it in a fixed relationship with respect to the receiver.

Claims 2-7 and 9-15 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 1.

Claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Moseley et al. by claiming that the transmitter and the receiver are maintained in a fixed relationship with respect to one another.

The transmitter is a handheld movable device and there would be no motivation to maintain it in a fixed relationship with respect to the receiver.

Claims 17-22 and 24-29 depend from claim 16, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 16.

Claim 30 patentably distinguishes over Moseley et al. by claiming that the transmitter and the receiver are maintained in a fixed relationship with respect to one another.

The transmitter is a handheld movable device and there would be no motivation to maintain it in a fixed relationship with respect to the receiver.

Claims 31-37 and 39-45 depend from claim 30, either directly or indirectly,

and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 30.

Claim 46 patentably distinguishes over Moseley et al. by claiming that the transmitter and the receiver are maintained in a fixed relationship with respect to one another.

The transmitter is a handheld movable device and there would be no motivation to maintain it in a fixed relationship with respect to the receiver.

Claims 47-53 and 55-62 depend from claim 46, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 46.

Claims 63-72 depend from their respective independent claim and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for the respective independent claim.

BRYDE ET AL.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 7-8, 10, 16, 22-23, 25, 30-31, 37-38, 40, 46-47, 53-54, 56, and 62-65 as being anticipated by Bryde et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,909,087.

Bryde et al. disclose a wireless handheld transmitter, an enclosure for a receiver, and a control circuit for an electrical device. (See Bryde et al., column 7).

Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Bryde et al. by claiming that the transmitter and the receiver are maintained in a fixed relationship with respect to one another.

The transmitter is a handheld movable device and there would be no motivation to maintain it in a fixed relationship with respect to the receiver.

Claims 2-7 and 9-15 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 1.

Claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Bryde et al. by claiming that the transmitter and the receiver are maintained in a fixed relationship with respect to one another.

The transmitter is a handheld movable device and there would be no motivation to maintain it in a fixed relationship with respect to the receiver.

Claims 17-22 and 24-29 depend from claim 16, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 16.

Claim 30 patentably distinguishes over Bryde et al. by claiming that the transmitter and the receiver are maintained in a fixed relationship with respect to one another.

The transmitter is a handheld movable device and there would be no motivation to maintain it in a fixed relationship with respect to the receiver.

Claims 31-37 and 39-45 depend from claim 30, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 30.

Claim 46 patentably distinguishes over Bryde et al. by claiming that the transmitter and the receiver are maintained in a fixed relationship with respect to one another.

The transmitter is a handheld movable device and there would be no motivation to maintain it in a fixed relationship with respect to the receiver.

Claims 47-53 and 55-62 depend from claim 46, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 46.

Claims 63-72 depend from their respective independent claim and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for the respective independent claim.

SCHWEIGER ET AL.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 9, 16, 24, 30-31, 39, 46-47, 55, 66-73 at being anticipated by Schweiger et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,351,206.

Schweiger et al. disclose an ignition lock system that includes a wireless handheld transmitter, an enclosure for the ignition system, a receiver inside the enclosure.

Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Schweiger et al. by claiming that the transmitter and the receiver are maintained in a fixed relationship with respect to one another.

The transmitter is a handheld movable device and there would be no

motivation to maintain it in a fixed relationship with respect to the receiver.

Claims 2-7 and 9-15 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 1.

Claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Schweiger et al. by claiming that the transmitter and the receiver are maintained in a fixed relationship with respect to one another.

The transmitter is a handheld movable device and there would be no motivation to maintain it in a fixed relationship with respect to the receiver.

Claims 17-22 and 24-29 depend from claim 16, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 16.

Claim 30 patentably distinguishes over Schweiger et al. by claiming that the transmitter and the receiver are maintained in a fixed relationship with respect to one another.

The transmitter is a handheld movable device and there would be no motivation to maintain it in a fixed relationship with respect to the receiver.

Claims 31-37 and 39-45 depend from claim 30, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 30.

Claim 46 patentably distinguishes over Schweiger et al. by claiming that the transmitter and the receiver are maintained in a fixed relationship with respect to one another.

The transmitter is a handheld movable device and there would be no motivation to maintain it in a fixed relationship with respect to the receiver.

Claims 47-53 and 55-62 depend from claim 46, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 46.

Claims 63-72 depend from their respective independent claim and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for the respective independent claim.

BANKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 9, 12-14, 16, 24, 27-29, 30-31, 39, 42-44, 46-47, 55, 58-60 are unpatentable over Banks, U.S. Patent No. 5,323,256 in view of Official Notice.

Banks disclose a transmitter, a receiver, an optical fiber. The Examiner suggests that it would have been obvious to enclose the servovalve and the receiver in an enclosure.

Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Banks by claiming an enclosure including a first device that selectively provides electrical power to the electrical device, wherein the electrical device is exterior to the enclosure.

The Examiner suggests that the servovalve and the receiver would be maintained in an enclosure, similar to other devices discussed above. Even if such a combination were proper, there would be no motivation for the claimed combination.

Claims 2-7 and 9-15 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 1.

Claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Banks by claiming a method for controlling a remotely located electrical device that includes an enclosure with a first device that selectively provides electrical power to the electrical device, wherein the electrical device is exterior to the enclosure.

The Examiner suggests that the sero valve and the receiver would be maintained in an enclosure, similar to other devices discussed above. Even if such a combination were proper, there would be no motivation for the claimed combination.

Claims 17-22 and 24-29 depend from claim 16, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 16.

Claim 30 patentably distinguishes over Banks by claiming an enclosure including a first device that selectively provides electrical power to the electrical device, wherein the electrical device is exterior to the enclosure.

The Examiner suggests that the sero valve and the receiver would be maintained in an enclosure, similar to other devices discussed above. Even if such a combination were proper, there would be no motivation for the claimed combination.

Claims 31-37 and 39-45 depend from claim 30, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 30.

Claim 46 patentably distinguishes over Banks by claiming an enclosure including a first device that selectively provides electrical power to the electrical device, wherein the electrical device is exterior to the enclosure.

The Examiner suggests that the sero valve and the receiver would be maintained in an enclosure, similar to other devices discussed above. Even if such a combination were proper, there would be no motivation for the claimed combination.

Claims 47-53 and 55-62 depend from claim 46, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 46.

Claims 63-72 depend from their respective independent claim and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for the respective independent claim.

The applicant respectfully requests that a timely notice of allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with applicant's attorney would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,
Chernoff, Vilhauer, McClung & Stenzel, LLP
1600 ODS Tower
601 SW Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

By: 

Kevin L. Russell
Pat. Reg. No. 38,292
Tele No. (503) 227-5631
FAX No. (503) 228-4373